

REMARKS:

Status of claims and amendments

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 5, 6, 12, and 13 have been withdrawn from consideration. In the Office Action dated August 4, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeichi, and objected to claim 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but containing allowable subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the instant amendments.

In this amendment, claim 1 was amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 8 was amended to include the subject matter of original claim 10. Claim 10 was canceled. Claims 11-13 were amended to be consistent with the cancellation of claim 10, from which they previously depended. No new matter is added.

The §102(e) rejection

The Examiner referred to Takeichi's Figure 2 and column 1, lines 14-20 as teaching a rotation bushing 25 installed in such a manner that said rotation bushing encompasses outer surface of a rotary shaft 60, and compresses or decompresses an outer surface of the rotary shaft, so that rotation on the rotary shaft is selectively limited.

However, column 1, lines 14-20 teach a positioning mechanism 2 (Figure 7) which permits rotation of a rotatable arm 1 through a series of retainable positions. Assuming for the sake of argument only that a "series of retainable positions" anticipates rotation on the rotary shaft being selectively limited, it is positioning mechanism 2, not hole 25, that accomplishes this limiting.

Regarding Figure 2, hole 25 and shaft pin 60 are not illustrated in this Figure. Figure 3, a cross-sectional view of Figure 2 (column 2, lines 11-12) does in fact illustrate hole 25 and shaft pin 60, but this Figure does not teach hole 25 compressing or decompressing an outer surface of pin 60.

In fact, Takeichi teaches that cylindrical hole 25 is just that: a hole. It is disclosed as "a cylindrical hole 25 is formed below the protrusion 24b. The cylindrical hole 25 extends in the up-and-down direction. The cylindrical hole 25 is closed at an upper end of the hole 25 and is open at a lower end of the hole 25 at the lower surface of the arm 20." (column 3, lines 46-50). Other than brief mentions in column 5, lines 9-24, regarding the dispositions of spring 50 and pin 60 relative to hole 25, this is the only disclosure of hole 25.

Hole 25 is not capable of compressing or decompressing the outer surface of pin 60. It therefore does not anticipate "a rotation bushing installed in such a manner that said rotation bushing...compresses or decompresses the outer surface of the rotary shaft, so that rotation on the rotary shaft is selectively limited" (claim 1, lines 3-6), nor "said locking mechanism comprises a compressible bushing surrounding the rotary shaft and a button mechanism cooperating with said bushing to compress the bushing around said shaft for locking thereto" (amended claim 8, lines 11-13).

Claims 1 and 8, as well as their dependents, claims 2-7, 9, and 11-13, are thus patentable over Takeichi.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Authorization is granted to charge any outstanding fees due at this time for the continued prosecution of this matter, or credit any overpayment, to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (matter no. 060943-0060).

Respectfully submitted,



October 11, 2006

Jessica C. Stahnke (Reg. No. 57,570)

Date

for Thomas D. Kohler (Reg. No. 32,797)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

One Market, Spear Street Tower

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.442.1000